

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested on the following bases:

1. The argument that "Applicant failed to provide a satisfactory showing that the relevant portions of the patent originated with or were obtained from the instant application and that that subject matter is now claimed."

This observation should be reconsidered since the Declaration is explicit that the material was obtained in the present application by the undersigned attorney who copied it from the previous application. Thus, there is no question but that the observation is incorrect.

2. The Applicant did not provide separate arguments with respect to art rejection of claims 1-15 and 26-30

No separate arguments are needed because the reliance on Tallam is misplaced. Since Tallam is not prior art, no further arguments are needed.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2009

/Timothy N. Trop/
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation